

REMARKS

I. Independent Claims 1 and 15

Claims 1 and 24 are rejected over Hull in view of Fujino. This rejection should be withdrawn, because the references fail to teach two limitations recited by both independent claims. These limitations are: 1) a “display” for “displaying the communications event history”; and 2) the “displaying” being performed “automatically”. These limitations are explained individually as follows:

1. The references fail to teach the claimed display for displaying a communications event history

Claims 1 and 15 recite “**displaying** the communications event history.” The claims are herein amended to clarify that the user interface performing the “displaying” is a “**display**”. This is supported in the application in the last nine lines of paragraph [0026] and in original claim 17.

This limitation (of a “display” that is “displaying the communication event history”) is lacking from the references. Even Hull’s keypad 105, which the Office Action apparently asserts corresponds to this limitation, is not a **display** for **displaying** the communication event history. Hull’s keypad 105 instead has only keys, each key simply illuminating to notify a user of reception and status of a message and modulating the light to indicate the message’s age.¹ Without any text capability, Hull’s keypad is neither a “display” as claimed, nor capable of “displaying the communication even history” as claimed.

2. The references fail to teach “automatically” displaying a communications event history

Both independent claims are amended to specify that the displaying of the communications event history is done “automatically”. This limitation is supported by the application in lines 23-26 of paragraph [0026]: “Upon receipt of a communications event, transceiver 118 begins to pass data to processor 122. In conjunction with communications event software interface module 126, processor 122 perform the method illustrated in Figure 3.” Accordingly, this is done once a message is received, and thus done “automatically”.

¹ As Hull’s abstract states: “Each key of the keypad is associated with a contact of a contact list. The light unit can perform light functions to notify a user of the reception and/or status of messages received via the transceiver. The light functions include providing an indication of the age of a received message that was sent by a contact in the contacts list. The age of the message is indicated by a modulation of the illuminating light.”

This limitation (of displaying the event history “automatically”) is lacking from the references. Although the Examiner asserts that Hull also discloses the subject matter of a display, it is clear from Hull [0038]² that any information that is displayed on the display 103 is activated by user input, and thus not done “automatically” as claimed but instead.

3. Conclusion regarding claims 1 and 15

Therefore, on at least two grounds, claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the cited prior art.

II. Dependent Claims 2-14 and 16-24

The remaining claims depend from base claims that are explained above as being patentable over the prior art. The limitations that the dependent claims add to the base claims distinguish them further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094

Date: 2/1/08

² As Hull [0038] states: “in response to the input by the user, mobile electronic communication device 100 can display information related to messages, if any, sent by the selected contact listed in the contact list.”